

Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah as a Lawyer

Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada*

Edgar Snow, the well known American author, noted that even if one only appraised Jinnah as a barrister, it would be to acknowledge that he had won the most monumental judgment in the history of the bar. He had recognized in the romantic ideal of Pakistan, a case that could be fought and won. Lord Denning, the Master of Rolls, in fact, Master of Rulings, had recalled with pleasure the fact that the Quaid-i-Azam, the Founder of Pakistan, had been a member of Lincoln's Inn. President Bill Clinton during his visit to Pakistan in the year 2000 at the lunch given in his honour by the Chief Executive remarked that Mr. Jinnah was the greatest constitutional lawyer of the Common Wealth. Jinnah's outstanding career as a Counsel is beyond any cavil or controversy whatsoever. In a Broadcast from B.B.C., Sir Stafford Cripps spoke of him as "a most accomplished lawyer outstanding amongst Indian lawyers and a fine constitutionalist." Last but not least, one might recall the opinion of Mahatma Gandhi, who, in his letter to Lord Birkenhead, described Mr. Jinnah and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru as the two cleverest lawyers of India.

In about 1892, the General Manager of Graham Trading Co., Karachi, an Englishman, who was a great friend of Jinnah's, offered to admit his son, Mohammad Ali, in the Head Office of the Company in London, as an apprentice for three years, where he could learn practical business administration to enable him to join his father's firm on return from London. Around January, 1893, Jinnah sailed for England. It seems that within three months of apprenticeship of the British Business Company, Jinnah decided to study law. Jinnah himself

* Senior Adviser to Prime Minister of Pakistan for Law, Justice and Human Rights.

recalled that as a young boy, when he saw for the first time a barrister robed in gown, wig collars and bands, he desired to be a barrister. Jinnah passed the usual preliminary examination to enable him to start his study of law and then joined Lincoln's Inn.

While addressing the Karachi Bar Association on the occasion of the birth of Prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him) on January 25, 1948, Jinnah disclosed the reason for joining Lincoln's Inn, because there, in the main Hall, in the huge fresco, the Holy Prophet (PBUH) was included among the Law Givers of the world.

Mr. Jinnah was enrolled on 24th August 1896 as an Advocate (O.S.) of the Bombay High Court. Through the kind offices of an old friend, he was admitted to the Chambers of John M. Macpherson, the Acting Advocate-General of Bombay. Besides being an erudite lawyer, Macpherson was a great gentleman, with an extremely fine presence and soothing voice. He was very kind to Jinnah. Jinnah was also for sometime in the Chambers of Sir George Lowndes, who afterwards became the Law Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, and later a member of the Privy Council. Lowndes had a very clear and lucid mind, and an extremely forceful and impressive manner of advocacy. Macpherson and Lowndes left lasting impact on Jinnah's personality. In 1900, came the first opportunity, when Mr. P.H. Dastoor, the Presidency Magistrate of Bombay, left his post on leave. To secure some financial support and to gain experience, Mr. Jinnah decided to apply for the temporary vacancy. Through the efforts of Macpherson, the Advocate-General, Mr. Jinnah was appointed as the Presidency Magistrate in May, 1900. From the cases dealt with and decided by Mr. Jinnah, it is apparent that he was an able, judicious and balanced magistrate, with a special care for legal detail. Mr. Jinnah officiated as Presidency Magistrate for a total of six months. On the expiry of this period, Sir Charles offered him a permanent appointment on a salary of Rs. 1,500 per month. Mr. Jinnah politely declined the offer, wryly adding that his ambition was to earn Rs. 1,500 a day. Eventually, Mr. Jinnah succeeded in earning Rs.1500/- a day which was a huge amount in those days.

Sensational cases apart, Mr. Jinnah had built up a solid, substantial and lucrative practice within a few years after his return to Bombay. He was the most versatile of advocates, practicing with equal success before civil and criminal courts, original and appellate sides of the High Courts, and last but not the least, before the highest tribunal of the Commonwealth, the Privy Council. Mr. Jinnah was a triple combination, Carson's 'cross-examination', Marshall Hall's 'Marshalling of facts' and Simon's 'subtlety of law'.

The Caucus Case

In 1907 the general elections to the Bombay Municipal Corporation were to take place. At that time, one of the constituencies was that of the Justices of Peace for the town and island of Bombay. They had to return 16 members. Sir Pherozeshah Mehta was consistently returned for many years by that constituency. Pherozeshah had by his services both inside and outside the Corporation acquired a commanding position in the deliberations of the Corporation. Some European members as well as the then Municipal Commissioner, Mr Sheppard, formed a clique which was in those days called the 'caucus' to defeat Pherozeshah at the polls. Harrison, the Accountant-General, Gell, the Police Commissioner and Lovat Fraser, the then Editor of *The Times of India* took a leading and active part in the campaign.

The poll was taken in the Municipal Hall on February 21, 1907 at a meeting of the Justices when the Municipal Commissioner, Sheppard presided. The result was declared the next day and 16 'caucus' ticket candidates succeeded and Pherozeshah Mehta stood seventeenth. Public indignation on the declaration of the result was very great. The 16 person who got in, was Suleman Abdul Waheed of Ladha Ibrahim & Co., who had contracts with the Municipal Act, disqualified from being a councillor. A petition was presented to the Chief Election Judge to declare that he was disqualified from being a Councillor and that Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, who stood 17 got automatically elected to the Corporation. Mr. Jinnah represented Sir Pherozeshah Mehta.

Mr. Jinnah's cross-examination of witnesses specially of Lovat Fraser, Editor of *Times* was devastating. Mr. Jinnah urged that:-

Mr. Haji Noormahomed gave his vote to Sir Pherozeshah on the first occasion, and exhausted his right of voting. On the second occasion when he voted for all the 16 candidates he acted contrary to law. A second illegal act could not destroy the legality of the first. The Counsel cited the case of *Queen vs. Avery* in support of his argument. Mr. Jinnah's contentions were accepted by the learned judge and Sir Pherozeshah was declared as duly elected to the Corporation. By getting the verdict in favour of Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, Mr. Jinnah was recognized as one of the leading lawyers.

Bal Gangadhar Tilak's Case

When Bal Gangadhar Tilak, prominent Indian National leader, was convicted for sedition, Mr. Jinnah appeared in the Appeal before the Division Bench of Bombay High Court and drew a distinction between disaffection and disapprobation. The sentence was set aside. Mr. Jinnah's legal acumen was acknowledged all over India. An attractive and

illustrated book *THE BOMBAY HIGH COURT 1878-2003* was published by the august Court through its heritage Committee consisting of eminent judges and leading lawyers in its introduction — Hall of Justice — it is stated: “In 1914, Tilak was prosecuted again on charges of sedition. This time, his legal counsel was Mohammad Ali Jinnah, a renowned lawyer of the Bombay Bar and a leader in the Indian National Congress. Jinnah was convinced that Tilak had been prosecuted for his strong views about Home Rule and independence for India and defended him so adroitly that Tilak was acquitted by the High Court.”

Some Leading Cases

In the suit of Haji Bibi concerning the Aga Khan, which is considered the longest suit in Bombay’s legal history, Mr. Jinnah represented Shamsuddin, one of the contesting defendants. The magnitude of the case may be gathered from the fact that voluminous evidence on commission was taken at various places all over the world, and as many as 128 issues were raised therein.

In the well-known defamation case of B.G. Horniman, Jinnah’s masterly handling led to the conviction of the editor, printer and publisher of the paper, Briton. Where Oscar Wilde had failed in a somewhat similar case, Horniman succeeded due to Jinnah’s skill.

In the Bowla Murder case, which arose out of the infatuation of the Maharajah of Indore for Mumtaz, the then Beauty Queen of India, and in which, at one stage, the well-known British criminal lawyer, Marshall Hall, was being brought in, Mr. Jinnah appeared for the main accused, and at least saved him from the gallows.

In the Jitekar Trust Suit, Mr. Jinnah dealt with the doctrines of Hanafi and Shafae Law. In Ranchood Narain and Ajoba and a number of other suits, Mr. Jinnah analysed certain aspects of Hindu Law, and its different schools, in considerable detail.

In 1921, Mr. Jinnah appeared for the petitioners to obtain a mandamus certiorari or other appropriate writ to quash various resolutions of the Bombay Corporation. This being the first case of its kind, the Court was reluctant to issue the writ.

In the case of the assassination of the author of *Rangila Rasool*, the assailant, Ilam Din, had been sentenced to death. In the appeal, Jinnah, representing him, pleaded that provocation coupled with the youth of the accused were good grounds for not inflicting the death penalty. The British Judges, however, did not allow any weight to these submissions; and the young man was executed. But since then Lahore has rarely seen such a procession of mourners as accompanied his funeral.

In *Salim Khatoon versus Arshadur Rehman*, Mr. Jinnah faced Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru before the Hyderabad High Court.

In the suit of the Raja of Nanpara, Jinnah appeared for the plaintiff and with his usual skill and ability, obtained a favourable decree that was upheld by the Privy Council. Mr. Jinnah represented the Editor of the *Bombay Chronicle* in a case of contempt of court. He defended Pir Pagaro in the trial court as well as in the appeal. In the Bhopal Waqf case, Chowdhry Naimatullah, a distinguished counsel, advanced a scholarly argument. But Jinnah's legal objection prevailed.

Some Anecdotes

"Mr. Jinnah", angrily shouted Justice Martin, "you are not addressing a third class magistrate". Rapiere-like flashed the counter-thrust: "There isn't a third class counsel before your Lordship."¹ Jinnah and Setalvad were appearing for opposite parties before the Judge on the original side in the High Court. At about five O'clock in the evening the learned Judge suggested to the Counsel to continue their arguments, as he was prepared to sit up to seven O'clock, in order to conclude the case. Jinnah retorted that since the Court time was 5:00 p.m., thereafter Lordship would be sitting alone, as he as well as Sir Setalvad had previous professional engagements. Both Counsel then left punctually as the hour struck.

In 1941, Jinnah appeared before the Sindh Chief Court for the appellants in the case of *Bishamberdas and Co. versus Sachoomal*. Thousands thronged to the Court to hear him or at least to see him. The Court room was jam-packed and the corridors were full when Chief Justice Davis and Justice Weston entered. Seeing the huge crowd, Davis, CJ, asked the Court Clerk to clear and close the doors of the Court-room. Jinnah got up and smilingly said that the doors of justice must always remain open. The Judges agreed to the suggestion provided the crowd remained quiet. Mr. Jinnah said to those present to remain quiet. The day's proceedings were then concluded smoothly.

Some Opinion on his Performance

Frank Moraes, the distinguished journalist and famous author, saw Mr. Jinnah in action in Court, He wrote: "Watch him in the court room as he argues a case. Few Lawyers command a more attractive audience. No man is more adroit in presenting his case. If to achieve the maximum result with minimum effort is the hall-mark of artistry, Mr. Jinnah is an

1. Joachim Alva, *Men and Supermen of India*, p.130.

artist in his craft. He likes to get down to the bare bones of a brief; in stating the essentials of a case his manner is masterly'. The Court room acquires an atmosphere as he speaks, junior's crane their necks forward to follow every movement of the tall, well-groomed figure; senior counsels listen closely; the Judge is all attention. Mr. Jinnah's voice has small volume. Its tone is low, but within its limited range it is surprisingly elastic. One moment it purrs persuasively, an interruption and its rasps."²

Joachim Alva, late Editor of the Forum, observed: "One place will long cherish Jinnah's memory; there it remains imperishable. Courage and sheer impudence have won him fame in the Law Courts. His hypnotic influence spreads his fame all over. His terrific encounters with the Judges and the bombshells he throws in the courts are well-known. As an Advocate, he possesses gifts which cast a spell on the Courts, the Judges, the Juries, the Solicitors, and Clients, all alike. As a Counsel, he has ever held his head erect, unruffled by the worst circumstances. He has been our boldest Advocate, no Judge dare bully him. He will not brook any insult. Jinnah's ready tongue and brilliant advocacy have worked off all judicial storms and won him all round admiration. Clients and Solicitors prize Jinnah's services for his matchless grit and courage to stand up for the causes he represents. Certain Judges, notorious for their calculated Suits to the junior practitioners, hold their tongue when face to face with Jinnah. Jinnah has preserved his position at the Bar intact and unsullied. Toadying or the remotest connection that excites suspicion is foreign to his nature. In short, he is the embodiment of the highest standards of the Bar. The compliment paid him that he is 'the Lord Simon of the Indian Bar' does not awkwardly sit on him."³

On the occasion of the Centenary of the Bombay High Court, K.M. Munshi, a prominent lawyer said: "M.A. Jinnah was another eminent Indian Lawyer of this period. Tall and impeccably dressed, he stood in a class by himself. His advocacy was characterized by strong commonsense, great courage and forthright approach. A man of great integrity, he would never stoop to trickery, though he could be devastating if a Judge or an opponent was inclined to be offensive. Once a firm of solicitors, on behalf of their clients, had asked him to put some questions in the Legislative Assembly, of which he was a member, and wanted to enlist his enthusiastic support by offering a sort of bribe in the shape of a brief for opinion marked 100 guineas, a colossal figure for such a brief in those days. He grew wild with rage and flung the brief out

2. *The Times of India*, 10 September 1939.

3. Joachim Alva, *Leaders of India*, p.79.

of his chamber. Once while attending a Conference with Strangman, he found the latter offensive. Immediately he walked out of the 9 and for years, never spoke to Strangman, nor addressed him as 'my learned friend'.⁴

Let me refer to the case of *B. Das & Co. (Appellant) vs. Broach Electric Supply and Development Corporation Ltd (Respondent)*. The Appeal was against the judgment of the single judge of the High Court, who was persuaded by Mr. Thamas Strangman to set-aside an award for the reasons that the letter marked without prejudice was tendered to the Arbitrator who read it but rejected it in evidence. The Solicitors engaged Mr. Jinnah for appellants, who argued the appeal before Marten C.J. and Crump, J. Mr. Strangman strongly defended the order but was over-ruled by the Bench. The learned judges held: In our opinion this finding of the learned judge cannot be sustained. Even if it was a case of a Judge in Court, documents are often tendered to the Court on which the Court has to decide whether they are admissible or inadmissible. If then one was to hold that in every case in which a judge rejects as evidence any document handed up to him, it follows that his mind must have been prejudiced by what he read and that consequently his judgment cannot stand, the result would be really absurd. The appeal must be allowed, and the notice of motion dismissed with costs."⁵

In his book, *Famous Judges, Lawyers and Cases of Bombay*, P.B. Vaehha writes. "Muhammad Ali Jinnah is in a sense the most celebrated member of the Bombay Bar, for he is the only man who, after extensive and eminent practice at the Bar for a number of years, ultimately passed into general history. He was very clear headed and he drove home his points both on law and facts with a lucid and persistent eloquence. He appeared in a number of important suits and appeals on the civil side, as well as in great criminal cases, including the famous Bawla Murder Case."⁶

Jinnah's mastery in the forensic field is apparent from the fact that one of his devils, M.C. Chagla, rose to be the Chief Justice of the High Court of Bombay, the first Indian to hold that office. In an article in the *Bombay Law Journal*, in 1927, Chagla observes: "Jinnah was a pure artist in the manner and method of his presentation. Even the most complex facts became simple and obvious when he waved his wand over them. He could be ferociously aggressive and almost boyishly persuasive,

4. *High Court of Bombay: 1862-1962*, p.99.

5. AIR 1928, Bombay, 55(1).

6. P.B. Vachha, *Famous Judge, Lawyers and Cases of Bombay*, p.150.

as and when the occasion arose, and what particularly helped in his advocacy was the absolute clear head that he possessed and on which he justly prided him had common sense, that most uncommon of qualities, in an uncommon degree.”⁷ More, recently, Chagla, reaffirming this view in his memoirs, wrote: “He had a very striking personality, and the presentation of a case as he handled it was piece of art. He was a superb advocate. He was also a first-rate cross-examiner. What impressed me most was the lucidity of his thought and expression. There were no obscure spots or ambiguities about what Jinnah had to tell the court. He was straight and forthright and always left a strong impression whether his case was intrinsically good or bad. I owe a great deal to him, because I learned in his chambers not only the art of advocacy, but how to maintain the highest traditions legal profession. Jinnah was absolutely impeccable in his professional etiquette.”⁸

Mr. M.H. Seervai, Advocate-General of Maharashtra and author of Constitutional Law paid tribute to Mr. Jinnah in a centenary meeting in 1976 and recalled: “The cases conducted by Mr. Jinnah in a masterly and effective way. For 44 years in the High Courts, he observed that Mr. Jinnah was the one of the greatest lawyers whom our courts have produced. Let me mention one other case in which a tribute to Jinnah’s power of cross-examination came from one of the most eminent lawyers of Palestine and one of the most distinguished lawyers whom I have met, Mr. Jinnah was engaged in a case, which came from Aden relating to the Estate of a man called Bunnin Mehssa. The Estate was worth ten crore Rupees (quite a large sum in those days). Against Jinnah’s client appeared as a witness a Palestine lawyer called Dr. Eliash, Well, you can understand Mr. Jinnah’s difficult task when I tell you that against the top expert in Palestine and a man of immense capacity Mr. Jinnah had the assistance of a Jewish butcher who had to tell him what the Hebrew text meant. I happened to be sitting next to Dr. Eliash because my leader was on that side, and he said to me “Mr. Jinnah has difficult task but I am greatly impressed with his cross-examination”. To have obtained that tribute from a man who seemed to be an unrivaled authority in Hebrew law, was a tribute well worth having.”

Judges on Jinnah

Jinnah’s forensic ability also earned judicial approbation. His exposition evoked admiration from judges and juries alike; and the judgments of cases in which he appeared are replete with appreciation of

7. Chagla in *Bombay Law Journal*, 1927.

8. M.C. Chagla, *Roses in December*, pp.54-55.

the skill and ability with which he conducted these cases. Professor Raza of St. Xavier's College, Bombay, who was empanelled on various juries, portrayed him as the 'magician with the monocle'. The professor recalled a murder case, wherein dissecting the evidence tendered by the prosecution, Mr. Jinnah at short intervals would pause and pose the question, "Is this the man?" When the jury retired, each one asked the other, "Is this man?" All of them had no hesitation in answering that this was not the man, and they returned a unanimous verdict of 'Not Guilty'.

Even a hostile Judge had to compliment Jinnah when the Jury, contrary to His Lordship's directions, decided to acquit the accused in the famous Allo Rape Case at Surat.

Justice Beamon, in *Pestonji versus Billimoria*, reaffirmed that hard cases notoriously make bad law. In that suit, the legatee had claimed the sum assigned to him in the deceased's Will. The defendant trustee contended that it appeared from the Will that this was not an ordinary bequest, but was intended to be no more than the satisfaction of the debt owed by the testator. Sir Jamshed Kanga wanted to lead evidence in support of this contention; but Jinnah objected on technical legal grounds. After discussing various arguments raised by both Counsels, His Lordship upheld the objection and observed:

When the case came on for trial, the first question raised was whether the defendant was entitled to lay before the Court evidence of facts alleged to have been in the testator's mind, and, therefore, necessary to be known to the Court before it could truly apply the language used by the testator in the second clause of the Will. This was, of course, strenuously opposed by Mr. Jinnah for the plaintiff who, like most Counsels of experience, is always most insistent on a legal technicality and most ingenious, and I may say persuasive, in proportion as he feels that if his ground fails him his case is lost. Nevertheless, after giving the matter my most anxious consideration during the whole of his argument, and the exhaustive and able reply to it by Mr. Kanga, I am still unable to free myself from the logical compulsion of the technicality upon which Mr. Jinnah has taken his stand.⁹

Justice Martin, in the case of *Tata Industries Bank Ltd.*, acknowledged thus: "I have had the advantage of a very useful argument from Mr. Jinnah, in the course of which I believe he has drawn my attention to all the points that can be said in favour of this client."¹⁰

In the instructive case of *Tricum Das Mills*, the doctrine of Indoor Management and complicated questions of Company Law were involved.

9. XII, B.L.R. 863.

10. XXV BLB, 1296.

In his exhaustive judgment, Justice Davar stated that “in this case some very interesting and important questions of law arise for consideration.” Dealing with Jinnah’s submissions, the learned Judge commented that “Mr. Jinnah has throughout the hearing expended much labour and argued with great skill and conspicuous lucidity.” In the end, while decreeing the suit in favour of Mr. Jinnah’s client, the learned Judge could not refrain from observing that “The plaintiff must feel much indebted to the exertions of Mr. Jinnah who conducted his case, for this result of the suit.”¹¹ The same learned Judge, in the case of the Advocate-General versus Fardoonji, wherein issues involved related to the doctrine of Cypress and the power of the Court to vary and alter the decree already passed, noted that “Mr. Jinnah has argued the question of the powers of the court with great care and much elaboration and cited several authorities in support of his contentious.”¹²

Justice Chandravarkar, in the case of Bibi Khaver Sultan, wherein the validity of a gift under Mohammedan Law came up for consideration, and His Highness the Aga Khan was examined as a witness, observed that “Mr. Jinnah conducted the plaintiffs case with considerable skill and ability.” The same learned Judge, in the suit of Raghirji Vizpal, a case of pledge and lien, complimented Jinnah “for having conducted the case with his usual ability”.

In the famous case of the Raja of Nanpara, at Lucknow, leading lawyers of India appeared against Jinnah. The learned Judge of the Oudh Chief Court, whose decision was upheld by their Lordships of the Privy Council, observed: “I must also express my sense of great indebtedness to Mr. Jinnah for his extremely able arguments, which were of great assistance to me in the decision of several difficult points of both fact and law involved in the case.”¹³

Their Lordships of the Privy Council very sparingly complimented any Counsel in their judgments and decisions. Lord Thankerton, in the reported judgment of the Privy Council in Abdul Majid Khan versus Saraswati Bai, made this special mention. “The arguments of the appellant were dealt with filly and clearly by Mr. Jinnah.”¹⁴

Patrick Spens, the last Chief Justice of undivided India, paid a tribute to “the tallness of the man, the immaculate manner in which he was turned out. Referring to Jinnah’s practice before the Privy Council,

11. VI, BLR, 983.

12. VIII, BLR, 922.

13. 1928, AIR, Oudh, 155.

14. AIR, 1934, PC, p.4.

Lord Spens said: “I think the Privy Council is the most critical. It is a friendly court, but is tremendously critical, and no one who had first class brains, a great power of advocacy, and above all great tact and politeness, would have made in so short a time such a fine practice as Mr. Jinnah did before the Privy Council.”¹⁵

All India Reporter

By way of summing up, one might recall the glowing tribute paid to Jinnah by the premier Legal journal of India. The All India Reporter: “Although Mr. Jinnah’s career as a political leader and as the representative of the successful Muslim Movement for separation in India overshadows all other aspects of his life, a legal journal like this has to take note of the fact that he was a lawyer of outstanding eminence and in his death our country has lost one of its greatest lawyers. As a brilliant advocate, he had few rivals. He was also universally recognized as a man of unimpeachable integrity, and honoured by friend and foe alike for his incorruptibility. Mr. Jinnah’s name will live in history as the greatest protagonist of the two nation theory in India and the creator of Pakistan.”¹⁶

Mr. Justice Davar

From the beginning Mr. Jinnah was for Independence of Judiciary. This is borne out by the following incident. After Justice Davar had sentenced Tilak to six years rigorous imprisonment, the Government conferred a knighthood upon Davar, and the Bar Association to the High Court of Bombay wanted to give him a dinner. A circular went round asking those who wanted to join the dinner to sign it. When the circular came to Jinnah, he wrote a scathing note to the effect that the Bar should be ashamed to want to give a dinner to a judge who had obtained a knighthood by doing what the Government wanted, and by sending a great patriot to jail with a savage sentence. It seems that Justice Davar came to know about this, and sent for Jinnah in his chambers. He asked Jinnah how he thought Davar had treated Jinnah in his Court. Jinnah replied that he had always been very well treated. Davar asked Jinnah next whether he had any grievance against him. Jinnah said he had none. Davar then asked: “Why did you write a note like this against me?” Jinnah replied that he wrote it because he thought it was the truth; and however well Davar might have treated him, he could not suppress his strong feeling about the manner in which he had tried Tilak’s case. All

15. Address to the Pakistan Society, London, 8 January 1960.

16. AIR, 1948 Journal, p.41.

this goes to demonstrate the great regard which Jinnah had for Talik, and also the courage and the spirit of nationalism which Jinnah displayed as a young man.¹⁷

Glowering Tribute

Let me conclude by referring the tribute paid by Mr. Justice Muhammad Munir, former Chief Justice of Pakistan on 23 March, 1976 in the Seminar at the University of Punjab, Lahore: "I have appeared with or against or heard as a judge some of the greatest lawyers of England and India-Lawyers like Mr. Pritt Q.C., Mr. Diplock Q.C. (now the Tr. Hon'ble Lord Diplock P.C.), soft-spoken Bhulabhai Desai, aggressive K.M. Munshi, another top lawyer of Bombay. Sir Tej Bahadur Supru pronouncing Arabic Sighas in a Wakf case, Mr. Hasan Imam, many bald and grey headed veterans of the Lahore Bar. But in my long experience I have never noticed that masterly analysis, classification and presentation of facts and the lucidity and subtlety of argument which I heard in a few Bombay cases argued by Mr. Jinnah."

17. M.C. Chagla, *Roses in December*, p.14.